

28th July 1953] [Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker]

“ Coming to the point of the hon. Member, Sri Venkateswarlu, he forgets that as a Member of the Opposition he is supposed to be a watchdog of the proceedings of this House. If he fails to act as the watchdog, why should I help him? It is not for me to wake up an Opposition Member. He must be alert and must do everything possible as a watchdog. I cannot help him in that respect.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The question is—

‘ That the Madras Tenants and Ryots Protection (Amendment) Bill, 1953, be passed into law.’ ”

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was passed into law.

(5) THE TUTICORIN PORT TRUST (APPLICATION TO MANGALORE)
BILL, 1953.

* THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to introduce the Tuticorin Port Trust (Application to Mangalore) Bill^a, 1953, and move—

‘ *That the Bill be taken into consideration at once.*’

“ Sir, in moving this Bill, I would like to say a few words by way of explanation about the need for bringing in this Bill and about one or two important provisions of this Bill.

“ So far as the need for the constitution of a Port Trust for Mangalore is concerned, I may submit that the National Harbour Board, in accordance with the recommendations of Sri Nanjundiah, Special Officer appointed to go into the question of survey and development of minor ports, has recommended that a Port Trust just on the lines of the Tuticorin Port Trust be constituted for Mangalore inasmuch as the minor port of Mangalore is second only to Tuticorin and is one of the important minor ports in the Madras State. I may submit, for the information of the hon. Members, that there are two kinds of ports in the Madras State, namely, major ports like Madras and Visakhapatnam which are under the administrative control of the Indian Union and minor ports which are under the management or control of the State. So far as this Bill is concerned, I may straightaway mention that there cannot be any dispute with regard to the principle, namely, that a Board of Trustees should be constituted for managing the minor port of Mangalore. At present, all the members are nominated under a Central Act. But, it is proposed under this new Bill that some sort of local autonomy should be given and that some representation should be given on this Board to the Mangalore Municipal Council and other trading interests in Mangalore. Therefore, I do not think that hon. Members would require an elaborate explanation as to the need for the constitution of this Board. I may also submit that the present Conservancy Board has not got very important powers. Their powers are very limited. But the Board that

^a Published in the Fort St. George Gazette, dated 15th April 1953.

[Sri N. Ranga Reddi] [28th July 1953]

is now proposed to be set up would have larger powers of sanctioning works. Therefore, the Board which is proposed to be set up under this Bill would satisfy the people to a very great extent. I may also submit that the trade at Mangalore Port has been flourishing, and the South Kanara Chambers of Commerce has been agitating for the constitution of a Port Trust for a very long time. It is in response to the demand of the South Kanara Chamber of Commerce and various other representations that the Government have introduced this Bill.

“ So far as the constitution of the Board is concerned, clause 5 of the Tuticorin Port Trust Act says that the strength of the Board would be not less than 13 and not more than 17. The present Bill proposes the introduction of an elective element, as it were, providing for 8 members, and it also provides for some nominations. Therefore, this is not a controversial measure and I hope that hon. Members would not take much time over the discussion of this Bill. I move that the Bill be taken into consideration at once.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Motion moved—

‘ That the Tuticorin Port Trust (Application to Mangalore) Bill, 1953, be taken into consideration at once.’ ”

* SRI K. KRISHNA RAO :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Bill relates to Port Trusts and we are asked to adopt an Act which was framed in 1924 when the British Government were here and an Act which was passed in 1908 when the British were here. One of the great efforts of the British was to see that the entire export trade in our land, the entire shipping, storage and other facilities, were in the hands of European merchants. That is why they saw to it that most of these Port Trusts were manned by Europeans under the guise of a Bengal Chamber of Commerce, or under the guise of perhaps a Madras Chamber of Commerce, and things like that. They also saw to it that these Port Trusts were essentially manned by elements nominated by the Government. Their idea was that they should consist firstly of European merchants, and secondly of Europeans nominated by the Governor, because till very recently all Governors were British Governors. Therefore, they wanted to see that these Port Trusts were a white man's monopoly or British monopoly and nothing more. It was a great struggle to the Indian businessmen to get control over the Port Trusts and most of them perhaps are not finding their places in the current national struggle. But all the same, it is a very big struggle, because let us understand what strategic position a Port Trust holds. Round about the port, there is some land and a good portion of it is given to the Port Trust. Now, whoever has got godowns built upon this land or whoever has got storage facilities thereon is in a very strategic position, and it not infrequently happens that most of these godowns and storage facilities are in the hands of very big British concerns. So, the effect of the Port Trusts being in the hands of Europeans has been disastrous on our trade and commerce. Because the storage facilities are in the hands

28th July 1943] [Sri K. Krishna Rao]

of European businessmen and because the entire shipping trade is in the hands of the British, what happens is that they encourage only British exports, British export houses and British gentlemen like Volkart Brothers. They do not encourage any Indian concern which wants to export goods from India and import goods from abroad. The result of it is that English businessmen have a tight monopoly grip over our trade in India and even over our economy.

“ The second point is that because of this monopoly, the Indian banks do not have any kind of facilities for clearing or discounting bills of lading. So also Indian fire and marine insurance companies are put to a lot of trouble. They do not get much business because the business is mostly monopolized by the British fire and marine insurance companies. Most of these shipping concerns who act as intermediaries between the shipping men and the banks do not accept any kind of fire and marine policy which is underwritten and which is given by an Indian fire and marine insurance company. That has been the struggle all along.

“ Now, we will have to go into all the provisions of the Act of 1924. There is no good ourselves adopting a Bill which was framed in 1924 and which was intended to encourage British business. Now, because it has been very emphatically said that we have attained nationhood and independence, we must also see that the shackles which the British commerce lays over our economy and over Indian businessmen are removed. We must see that full scope, freedom and liberation are given to Indian businessmen and Indian commerce generally to prosper, and in fact, to get preference. We must see that any efforts made by the British interests to create obstacles to the growth of Indian trade are curbed. If that is to be done, one of the immediate things is to see that the Port Trusts are manned entirely by our men. The Tuticorin Port Trust Act was enacted in 1924. Therefore, if the Government here wanted to show that they were an Indian Government and not a Government in any way influenced by the British, what they should have done was to change the Tuticorin Port Trust Act itself. In fact, the Government of India should have taken steps to get the Madras Port Trust Act amended. Instead of that, we are asked to take a copy of the Bill of 1924 which was intended to shackle Indian business, and adopt it for Mangalore also. This, I say, is wrong because we are under new conditions. We do not have the same old Governors and the same old Executive Council Members, but we have now a Legislative Assembly and a Ministry responsible to the Legislature. Under these circumstances, it was very wrong of the Government to have asked us to adopt without question the 1924 Act, which was intended for protection of interests other than Indian interests, for Mangalore. They should have gone into the whole question afresh and made suitable modifications.”

11-40
a.m.

* SRI T. ANANTHA PAI :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am glad that the Government, in response to the considerable public opinion as represented by the various business bodies like the Kanara

1584 THE TUTICORIN PORT TRUST (APPLICATION TO MANGALORE)
BILL, 1953

[Sri T. Anantha Pai] [28th July 1953]

Chamber of Commerce, have at last come forward with a Bill to create a Port Trust for the port of Mangalore. At the same time, the explanation that has been given in a Note circulated to the Members has created certain misapprehensions in our minds. It is true that the National Harbour Board, in accordance with the recommendations of Mr. Nanjundiah, recommended to this Government the creation of a Port Trust for Mangalore. But, Mr. Nanjundiah had made it very clear that this Port Trust must not be saddled with any responsibility or liability from the very beginning. In fact, certain experiments are now being carried on in Poona, the cost of which is very likely going to be debited to this Port Trust if the Government do not make their intentions clear from the very beginning. Otherwise, it would not be quite fair for the Port Trust to commence its work of managing the port with its own resources and with this liability added on to it. I say this because in the Note that has been circulated it is said that the formation of a Port Trust at Mangalore will itself give the people of Mangalore the opportunity to develop their port with their own resources. It might mean that the Government think that all the development that should take place in Mangalore in future is the responsibility of the citizens of Mangalore and not that of the Government. That might be the interpretation and it is supported by a further Note to the following effect :—

‘ Further, number of works estimated to cost in all Rs. 7,25,000 for the improvement of the port are now under consideration. The need for the creation of a Port Trust for the administration of the port has been greater than ever before.’

That means that because of this expenditure which is now likely to be incurred to improve the port, the creation of a Port Trust has become necessary. I only say that it is not fair to the Port Trust that is to be created. The development of the port has nothing to do with the creation of a Port Trust. If the trade requires it or if the trade requires facilities to be provided for the development of a port, that is a responsibility which the State has to take upon itself. But the creation of a Port Trust does not mean that that responsibility should be transferred to the citizens. The citizens themselves, whatever be the name given to it, whether it be a Port Trust or municipality, will not be able to take up the responsibility unless the State also feels the responsibility and gives them assistance throughout. I request the Government to consider this factor very seriously because, if the creation of the Port Trust means that the responsibility for the improvement of the port in future will be the entire responsibility of the Port Trust and that the Government will not be able to come forward with financial help, I am afraid this Port Trust will not help the development of the port or help to make the people take up this responsibility.

“ So far as the amendments are concerned, I do not see any need for amending the Bill as it is. For one thing, even if the Tuticorin Act was passed in 1924, the provisions incorporated here are not going to make any difference so far as Mangalore is concerned. Of course, an hon. Member opposite has referred to the

28th July 1953] [Sri T. Anantha Pai]

possible infiltration of British domination over the port of Mangalore. But I have to make it very clear that we in South Kanara are not affected by any British phobia and we are not afraid of any British association with us. We are thankful to all the English firms that are operating in Mangalore and working in close co-operation with us, and we look forward to continued co-operation from them, so long as this does not affect the overall foreign relations of our country. It has also been suggested that representation must be given to people who are interested in trade. I feel that adequate representation has been provided for the Kanara Chamber of Commerce which has on its rolls practically every merchant and everybody who is interested in trade in Mangalore. On the whole, the provisions of the Bill will adequately cover various interests. So, I think the Bill may be passed as it is without any amendments."

11-50
a.m.

* SRI B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA :—“ Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of Mangalore, I wish to express our gratitude to the Government for having brought forward this measure. I am saying this, because this is something for which the people of Mangalore have been agitating for the past several years. I can undoubtedly and unhesitatingly say that it has come a little too late and not too early. Because, for the past several years, the port of Mangalore has not received the attention that it richly deserves. I might remind the House that, during the past years, there has been a fairly large surplus amount from the port of Mangalore which was diverted to the Common Fund along with the surpluses of other ports which ultimately were diverted by the Government towards the general revenues. It is something which ought to have been used and utilized for the Mangalore Port and other minor ports. Instances of this kind have been making the people of Mangalore feel that a Port Trust would serve them better. To mention a few amenities that are absolutely essential for the port of Mangalore, river dredging has to be attended to, and a lot of silt which has accumulated for decades and has remained there unattended thus rendering the port less useful than before has also to be cleared. Facilities for passengers, especially for those passengers who have got to go a long distance to reach the steamer which will be far away in the ocean are very meagre. For the goods that are landed, shelter is practically nil with the result there has been considerable suffering which could have been avoided. I do not want to go into greater details regarding the many other instances which have led the people of Mangalore to ask for a Port Trust. No doubt, it would have been better and proper if a separate Bill by itself had been brought forward in respect of Mangalore instead of referring to a Bill on Tuticorin of the order of 1924 or thereabouts. Perhaps it was only with a view to minimising the work, this has been done like that. Certainly, this criticism, this adverse criticism, could have been avoided. After all, as I feel it, the manner of doing it is not so important because when the Port Trust comes into force, it will serve the area, irrespective of the fact whether this Bill is put separately or Mangalore is included with the provisions relating to Tuticorin, as is done now.

[Sri B. Vaikunta Baliga] [28th July 1953]

"With regard to the fears expressed by hon. Member Sri Krishna Rao coming from Nellore, I join Mr. Pai in affirming before the House that we do not have the trouble of the kind that he has mentioned. But all the same, so far as the constitution of the Board of Trustees is concerned, the Hon. Minister has mentioned that there is going to be election also. Several of these seats are going to be thrown open for election and representation by the Chamber of Commerce, Western India Tiles Manufactures' Association; and the Municipal Council will be given representation. Over and above these seats for the various institutions, nominations will be made by the Government. So, the Government of the day or the party in power at any particular time, will take care of the other interests which will not be attended by these representatives. In short, I wish to support this Bill and request the Government to look after this Bill and also put in proper safeguards to which mention has been made by hon. Member Sri T. Anantha Pai. It will be an infant institution and the Government should not make it carry too much of burden which can legitimately be avoided. The Government must bless it so that the people of Mangalore may husband their resources to their advantage. When Mangalore Port is administered properly, it will be very helpful; and other ports, I must say, will follow suit. It will mean relieving the burden of the Government to some extent and result in making us organized for our own betterment and especially in giving facilities to the people all round. Sir, I once again welcome this Bill and request all the hon. Members to support it unanimously and without any dissension."

* THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI:—"Sir, I am indeed grateful to the hon. Members coming from South Kanara for having supported the various provisions of this Bill. They have dispelled the apprehensions raised by hon. Member Sri Krishna Rao with regard to some of the provisions. I may straightway say that I cannot agree with Mr. Krishna Rao when he said that whatever was done during the days of the British rule is bad, and that it should be revised. There are good things and there are bad things. If any particular thing is bad, it is for us to find out how it is bad and how best it can be rectified. Now let us see whether the criticism of Mr. Krishna Rao is justified. Is this Bill going to support the British elements? Or, is this Bill going to support the Britishers in any way? Will this Bill in any way promote their trade interest? I say for all these questions, 'Not at all, Sir'. The hon. Members from South Kanara have said that there is no British element and that no Britisher is interested in this Bill. There is none of them who will profit by the Bill. I may submit that the constitution of the Board is a sufficient guarantee that no British interest will be allowed to come in. Eight members are to be elected by the various elective bodies. For instance, we have the Mangalore Municipal Council or the South Kanara Chamber of Commerce. What sort of British interest can the hon. Member expect to be in these institutions? With regard to the Western India Tiles Manufactures' Association, it will also be represented by its representatives. As

28th July 1953] [Sri N. Ranga Reddi]

regards the nominated elements, three of them will be officials. One will be the Collector of South Kanara, the other will be the local Superintendent of Customs and the third will be a representative of the Southern Railways. None of them are going to support the Britishers. Again, under section 5, it will be seen that one of the trustees will be a representative of the trade unions. Therefore, I submit that there is no reason to suppose that this Board of Trustees will in any way be inimical to the interests of the Indians. I have nothing more to add. I request that this Bill may be taken into consideration at once."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' That the Tuticorin Port Trust (Application to Mangalore) Bill, 1953, be taken into consideration at once.' "

The motion was put and carried.

Clause 2.

* THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" Sir, I move—

' For sub-clause (2), substitute the following :—

" (2) *The Tuticorin Port Trust Act, 1924 (Madras Act II of 1924), with the adaptations and modifications set out in the Schedule, incorporated in the said Act, shall be called the Mangalore Port Trust Act, 1953. A copy of the Mangalore Port Trust Act, 1953, shall be prepared by the Secretary to Government, Legal Department, and published in the Fort St. George Gazette.*" "

12
noon.

In moving this amendment I would like to make a few observations. I am indeed grateful to the hon. Member, Mr. Krishna Rao, for having brought to the notice of the Government that the original clause as it stood in the Bill was liable to be misunderstood that it would be a question of delegation of power to the Secretariat for preparing a Bill. Sir, it is only an administrative direction which was given to the Secretariat to prepare the Bill with the adaptations and modifications set out in the Schedule and in the note circulated yesterday to hon. Members this explanation has been given and I hope Members will be satisfied with it."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' For sub-clause (2), substitute the following :—

" (2) *The Tuticorin Port Trust Act, 1924 (Madras Act II of 1924), with the adaptations and modifications set out in the Schedule, incorporated in the said Act, shall be called the Mangalore Port Trust Act, 1953. A copy of the Mangalore Port Trust Act, 1953, shall be prepared by the Secretary to Government, Legal Department, and published in the Fort St. George Gazette.*" "

The amendment was put and carried.

Clause 2 as amended was put and carried.

[28th July 1953]

Schedule.

* SRI K. KRISHNA RAO :—“ Sir, I move—

In paragraph 2 of the Schedule, the following may be added in the Table :—

“ Section 5—For sub-section (2), substitute the following :—

All the trustees shall be citizens of India, of whom at least three shall be persons engaged in sea-borne trade at Mangalore and not more than one-sixth may be Government officials.

Section 6—Instead of the words ‘ one Trustee ’ in sub-section (3), substitute the words ‘ two Trustees ’ and at the end of sub-section (3), add the words ‘ such election being conducted by secret ballot and even when there is no contest, a person being deemed to have been elected if he obtains an absolute majority of the votes of members present at the meeting when there is no contest ’.”

Sir, the strength of the Port Trust is between 13 and 17 and the original section says that one-third of the members may be nominated by the Government. What my amendment seeks to do is that that one-third should be reduced to one-sixth because the days of nomination by Government are gone. They were days when the Government said that we were still suckling babies, that we did not know anything of public affairs and that we could not manage our own affairs. It was in such days that there was one-third nomination and the idea to day is old-fashioned and antiquated. I say that it should be made one-sixth.

“ There is another provision with regard to which I want to say a word. In the original Act, it is said that not less than one-third shall be Indian nationals. That is what is clearly laid down in the Act. My point is that there should be no place for any one on the Trust who is not a citizen of this country. The Government may alter the provision or may not alter it. From the note which is circulated by the Government it is clear that the exports from Mangalore are coffee, coir and things like that. We know that the coffee trade is largely dominated by European interests and European planters and we do not want any European interests to be there on the Trust. In the Tuticorin Port Trust Act, it is made compulsory that there should be a third of Indian nationals. Now I say all must be Indian citizens.

“ Then about representation for trade unions, the procedure at present is this. The trade unions will be asked to select three persons and submit a panel. From out of those three, the Government will select one. My contention is that position was all right in 1924 when the working class in South India or in India was not awakened and was not alive to its own responsibilities. Therefore, I have suggested there should be two people who should be taken into the Port Trust from among those working in the ports. There

28th July 1953] [Sri K. Krishna Rao]

should be two representatives. I have also said that these representatives should be elected at meetings and if there is no contest, there should be a ballot-box and the man should be deemed to be elected only if he secures an absolute majority of the members present at the meeting. Otherwise, what happens is these elections become just faked up ones. They just keep only one man, forcing any other keep away from the election and is said to be returned unopposed. These are the amendments I have proposed and they seek to adapt the existing provisions of the Act to present conditions. In the past, Sir, Municipal Councils had nominated elements. We had lived that day. We have passed those days, when people thought that unless there was a Collector at the head of a district, the whole administration would go to rack and ruin. The Port Trust should be an autonomous body and the people of the locality should have representation. You can give representation to the businessmen of the locality. You can give representation to the Chambers of Commerce, to the trade institutions there. Make the Port Trust more and more autonomous. By my amendment, I want the nominated element to be cut down and the elected element to be increased."

The amendment was duly seconded.

* SRI S. RAMALINGAM :—" Sir, I move—

' Insert the following in paragraph 2 of section 6 (2) (a) of the Act :—

" (iv) Members of the Legislative Assembly from South Kanara district—Two trustees.

(v) Port workers—One trustee "'

Sir, the Hon. the Minister was pleased to say that the Port Trust will have larger powers in the administration of the port and will practically be an autonomous body subject to the general control of the State Government. On the formation of the port, the Members from the district should have an opportunity to develop their port. Therefore, I have said that the Members of Legislature from South Kanara should be given two seats. So also in the case of workers who work in the port. They should have a share in the administration of the port and all other connected matters. I think the Government will accept the amendment."

* THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" I am sorry I cannot accept the amendment of Mr. Ramalingam. The Bill itself provides for one representative for the trade unions and it should satisfy my friend. There need not be any greater representation for the trade unions. My hon. Friend, Mr. Krishna Rao, has suggested that the Port Trust is being dominated by official elements and that the official elements should be cut down. Let me tell him that Mr. Nanjundiah who was deputed by the National Harbour Board to enquire into the conditions of development of minor ports in the Madras State paid the very highest compliments so far as Madras was concerned that

1590 THE TUTICORIN PORT TRUST (APPLICATION TO MANGALORE)
BILL, 1953

[Sri N. Ranga Reddi] [28th July 1953]

the administration of minor ports in the Madras State was very good. I do not say that on that account we should retain the official elements. Even at the time of the introduction of the Bill I have submitted that, as far as possible, nomination would be confined to those interests concerned and if I had not mentioned the details, I would like to mention them now so that the hon. Member may be satisfied.

“ So far as the nominations are concerned, there will be two persons engaged in sea-borne trade in Mangalore; they will be one to represent the interests of the country craft owners and the other to represent the steamers carrying cargoes and passengers from Mangalore Port; the other three officers I have already mentioned.

“ My hon. Friend has suggested that so far as coffee planters are concerned, they are mainly Europeans and if nomination is given to that particular interest, it will be dominated by the European elements. I may submit, Sir, that so far as coffee planters are concerned, they have been working in very close contact with the South Kanara Chamber of Commerce and there is no question of the South Kanara Chamber of Commerce being dominated by these planters and after all it will be the South Kanara Chamber of Commerce that will have a dominating voice with regard to these matters. Therefore, I submit, Sir, there is no reason to fear that the Europeans will have a dominating voice in this Port Trust. So I oppose both the amendments moved by the hon. Sri Krishna Rao and also by Mr. Ramalingam.”

SRI K. KRISHNA RAO :—“ May I know, Sir, whether the Hon. Minister is opposing even that amendment which says that all the trustees shall be Indian Nationals? ”

* THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“ Sir, Government have felt that there is no need to have that amendment at present. We are making provision for the applicability of the Tuticorin Port Trust Act to the Mangalore Port Trust also. There is no necessity for the amendment now.”

The amendments of Sri K. Krishna Rao and Sri S. Ramalingam were, by leave, withdrawn.

The Schedule was put and carried.

Clause 1 and the preamble was put and carried.

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“ I move—

‘ That the Tuticorin Port Trust (Application to Mangalore) Bill, 1953, as amended, be passed into law.’ ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Motion moved—

‘ That the Tuticorin Port Trust (Application to Mangalore) Bill, 1953, as amended, be passed into law.’ ”

* SRI K. KRISHNA RAO :—“ Sir, I take this opportunity to request the Government to develop these ports, because the most

28th July 1953]

[Sri K. Krishna Rao]

neglected things in our country are the ports, though South India had been a maritime power in the past—there is a very long history about it. Though there may be a Madras here, a Cochin there, a Visakhapatnam there or a Calcutta there, many of the minor ports have not been developed and they have been left in a neglected condition. Now that Mangalore is going to be developed. I hope this would be a prelude for the development of similar ports in Andhra and in all parts in the East Coast also. If we do that, I think there is very great scope for the improvement of our industries and agriculture in most of the coastal regions. There are some most neglected regions, something akin to agency areas; nobody goes there, nobody knows the woes of the people there. Only when people go and settle there in large numbers that you would improve the sea coast and maritime trade. I hope the Government would try to see that the Mangalore Port develops and also to develop the Indian industry and commerce in those areas."

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"I am thankful and grateful to the Chair for giving me an opportunity to support the Bill. I want to bring to the notice of the Government two facts. That is, the Kakinada Port requires a Port Trust. Of course, the Hon. Finance Minister and the Hon. Chief Minister may say that 'you are going to have a province, you can do everything to improve Kakinada.' But that is not enough. My other submission is that passengers who want to go to Burmah should be picked up either at Kakinada or at Visakhapatnam. Thousands of people are going to Calcutta or Madras, get themselves into many complications and finally go back to their houses without being able to go to Burmah or other countries. These places are about 500 miles from Andhra area. There is a sea coast of 500 miles in Andhra. There are some ports, especially like Kakinada and Visakhapatnam ports. But passengers are not picked up there. I submit that Government should strive to make the cargo and other ships stop at Visakhapatnam or Kakinada and pick the passengers who want to go to Burmah or anywhere else without putting them to unnecessary trouble or expenditure. I support this Bill wholeheartedly."

* THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI:—"Sir, I would like to assure my hon. Friend, Mr. Krishna Rao that the development of minor ports would be taken up consistent with the financial position of the Madras State. I may also state that the Madras Government have pressed for a particular portion to be given from the centre by way of interest-free loan, so that that amount can be utilized for the development of minor ports. So far as the Mangalore Port itself is concerned, the House would see that nearly Rs. 7 lakhs has been proposed for the improvement of the port. Similarly consistent with our financial position, the minor ports of the Madras State will be attended to. I think the House would be satisfied with the assurance given by the Government."

[28th July 1953]

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The question is—

‘ That the Tuticorin Port Trust (Application to Mangalore) Bill, 1953, as amended, be passed into law.’ ”

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was passed into law.

(6) THE MADRAS PRESERVATION OF PRIVATE FORESTS
(AMENDMENT) BILL,^a 1953.

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ I beg to introduce the Madras Preservation of Private Forests (Amendment) Bill, 1953, and move—

‘ That the Bill be taken into consideration at once.’

“ Sir, this Bill is necessitated in this manner. Now in Malabar and South Kanara districts, there are blocks of forests of more than a hundred acres which are situated contiguously and protected from indiscriminate felling of trees. In the working of the Act, some difficulties were found. That is, the owners of these forests circumvent the law by leasing out or mortgaging and also when there are joint-holders and when there are different claimants to it, they take advantage of that and the purpose of the law is defeated. Now it is sought to amend the Act so as to bring the indiscriminate felling in areas under 100 acres under the purview of the law. There is another provision with regard to the date. The Act provides that any alienation of private forest on or after the 16th August 1916 shall be null and void. Some new forests may come into existence and we have altered the date suitably. Therefore, this amending Bill is necessary. I request the House to take the Bill into consideration at once.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The motion before the House is—

‘ That the Madras Preservation of Private Forests (Amendment) Bill, 1953, be taken into consideration at once.’ ”

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“ Mr. Speaker, I move—

‘ That the Madras Preservation of Private Forests (Amendment) Bill, 1953, be referred to a Select Committee.’

Sir, I think my friends from Malabar will be able to speak more exhaustively on this subject than myself. We are not able to understand the implications of this amending Bill. While supporting my amendment, I leave the details to my friends from Malabar.”

SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR :—“ Sir, I second the amendment moved by my hon. Friend Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah.”

* SRI R. KRISHNAN :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട മെമ്പർ ശ്രീ വാവിലാല ഗോപാലകൃഷ്ണൻ ഭരതഗതിയെ ഞാൻ സപ്പോർട്ട് ചെയ്യുകയാണ്. മലബാറിലെ സ്ഥിതി ആലോചിക്കുകയാണെങ്കിൽ നിലവിലുള്ള വനസംരക്ഷണ നിയമങ്ങൾ നമ്മുടെ വന സമ്പത്തു് രക്ഷിക്കുവാൻ കട്ടിത്തന്നെ പര്യാപ്തമായിട്ടില്ല. ഈ ബില്ലിനു്